

REMARKS

I. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner on pages 2-3 lists numerous typos/informalities and also noticed that trademarks have not been properly identified in the specification. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough review. Applicant has made all the requested amendments (plus a few more found by the Applicant). Applicant thus respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

II. CLAIM REJECTION – 35 USC § 101

The Examiner on page 4 states “[c]laims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.” Applicant has amended the claims and, while not admitting that the original claims were directed towards non-statutory subject matter, respectfully asserts that the amended claims now clearly show the invention is directed towards statutory subject matter.

In particular, all the preambles and steps in all of the independent claims (1, 7, 13 and 19) have been amended to explicitly recite that the steps are performed by a Facilitator’s web site. The Examiner on page 4 stated that the method as claimed could have been performed by a human being. The amendments moot this argument by explicitly stating that all the claimed steps are performed by a Facilitator’s web site.

In addition, all the independent claims (1, 7, 13 and 19) include the limitations of the “Internet” and a “server” hosting the Entrepreneur’s web site. The Internet and hosting servers are described in the specification and are well known in the art to those of ordinary skill. The Internet and hosting servers comprise sophisticated electrical and communication systems that perform well defined functions and therefore may reasonably be considered particular apparatuses. Thus, the amended claims are directed towards statutory subject matter under *in re Belski* which permits method claims tied to a particular apparatus. With the amendments, all claims are now tied to at least two different particular apparatuses.

III. CLAIM REJECTION – 35 USC § 102

The Examiner on pages 4-5 states “[c]laims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) based upon a public use or on sale of the invention.” Applicant traverses this rejection.

The 02 February 2003 Go Daddy copyright service and all other Go Daddy copyright services used or sold more than one year prior to the filing date of the patent application (hereafter “prior Go Daddy service”) required a customer to upload their copyrightable material to Go Daddy’s website in a copyrightable format.

The amended claims are different from the prior Go Daddy service in at least two ways. First, independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 have been amended to make it clearer that the copyrightable material is obtained by the Facilitator’s web site accessing the Entrepreneur’s web site. This step of the Facilitator’s web site obtaining the copyrightable material directly from the Entrepreneur’s web site was not used or sold by the prior Go Daddy service.

Second, independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 have been amended to include the step of the Facilitator’s web site translating the material obtained from the Entrepreneur’s web site into a format acceptable to the USCO. The step of translating the material into a format acceptable to the USCO was also not used or sold by the prior Go Daddy service because the prior Go Daddy service required the copyrightable material to be submitted to Go Daddy’s web site in a format already acceptable to the USCO.

Since neither of these two amended limitations was used or sold by the prior Go Daddy service, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103 (a)

The Examiner on page 8 states “[c]laims 4-6, 10-12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Go Daddy in view of copyright.gov (weblink).” Claims 4-6, 10-12 and 16 have all been cancelled, thereby making this rejection moot.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that not all of the claim limitations are shown or performed by the prior Go Daddy's service as explained above. Applicant thus requests the allowance of all pending claims, i.e. claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15 and 19, as soon as possible. Any questions or suggestions regarding this Amendment should be directed to the undersigned attorneys for Applicants at the telephone number or email address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

The Go Daddy Group, Inc.

Date: 1/22/2009

By: /Stewart J. Womack/
Stewart J. Womack
Reg. No. 45,230
Attorney for Applicant

The Go Daddy Group, Inc.
14455 N. Hayden Road, Suite 219
Scottsdale, AZ 85260
480.505.8832
SWomack@GoDaddy.com